3/31/70

Dear Harold,

Today came your letters to me of 3/21 and 28 plus one to Paul.

3/21 on Specter: Glad you liked it. I think I can make use of it too, probably in a different way than you. I'd like to take his opening statement as he explains the likelihood and probability of SBT and answer it step by step. By using his own words and arguement, it could not be argued that I was misrepresenting the theory. What gets me is what he said to LIFE about this being the only alternative although one cannot know all the alternatives. It is beyond comprehension that he missed the one obvious alternative. For the MC to have been used, I agree--a bullet through the neck must have hit Connally. But every shred of evidence vitiates that. i.e.-another rifle was used.

Tink could answer none of Specter's points, and his own(rather what he published as his own) theory about the JBC hit got torn to shreds by S and the audience. I remember the day after that debate a teacher familiar with my work told me that while he had doubts before, this did more to boost his faith in the WR than anything else.

His remark on the goatskin goes good with Fillinger's. Also, note how he reacted when Tink laughed as S brought up the fact that the autopsy docs swore under oath. He really snapped out and admitted that he viewed it as a serious matter. And dig his non-answer to the back wound question. He hemmed and hawed on that one, the transcript not reflecting his pauses between words.

RAP BROWN: While I know nothing of explosives or related matters, I will check some good books when I get to the library, possibly send photostats of anything which might help. When I saw the news conference which indicated that the explosion came from within the car, on the floor in front, I asked myself if it was possible that the explosive had been thrown into the car from outside so that it landed on the floor and then exploded. I don't know if they could tell if this had happened from, let's say, the way the windshield was broken or what. Nor do I know how bad the car was damaged.

Your 3/28 to me: This is what the Archives told me about the shirt slits. They have prepared two photos of the shirt, "one of which shows the slits." They add that they show this to researchers and can show it to me if I go there. Then they add, "We do not furnish photographs of the shirt except the photographs among the records of the WC." Would that include these? If so, you may want me to order copies. The one which I know shows the slits is FBI exhibit 60, first printed in Inquest. I think I will order a copy of it. It is not clear and must be taken from a printed page from the FBI report, hence have engraver's dots.

You should have heard from Dick by now about his relationship with Lifton.

On the memo of transfer, I did not realize it included more than the pix and X-rays. I've always wondered about the rest of JFK clothes, such as pants. While I know the possibilities of a wound there are remote if impossible, the absence of pants plus X-rays of lower legs makes me wonder. At least, we have no basis to assert that there was no wound there.

As for the other memo I mentioned, this is all I know if it. It comes from Humes testimony:

> Attached to this garment(the caot) is the memorandum which states that one half of the area around the hole which was presented had been removed by experts...and also that a control area was taken from under the collar..(2H365).

I have written for a copy of this, and await reply.

As for the whereabouts of the slides and brain, it is hard to imagine just where they could be. This may encompass what Fil knows but can't tell or, possibly, Wecht might know where it is. He seems to know that it still is around for he points out to me that the Panel never examined it, implying that they could have if they wanted.

To me, the possibility of a later head hit is eliminated. If anything hit that head in the state it was after 313, we would see signs of it (shooting into mud) but I have closely examined all the frames after the A slides end (on my copy of Z) and the head is not disturbed.

Chest wound: I interpret the chest matter as material, considering the possibility of chest damage--internal, that is. I do not believe you have indicated whether you agree with the objective part of what I say, that Humes lied (forget the perjury), and Specter knew it, and tried to correct the record, even to lead Perry to say what was not true. If you get a chance, go beyond my memo and examine the record itself. It is a pretty clear case. Without saying why this happened, would you agree that it did in fact happen? I think there is no denying it. With that in mind, the next question is why. There must have been some motivation behind this, no? Enough to arouse our suspicion?

The Parkland docs would not know if there was underlying chest damage for they did not see into the chest from this point. Remeber that they originally suspected lung damge, one being almost positive that the pleura was violated?

Perhaps it was not perjury; I really don't care about that. However, it does have great implications, and I view it as important.

Neck fragments: Very good suggestion that the fragments may be fragmentation from a fragment. However, "the remainder going elsewhere" is the problem. I still argue that there is no basis to assert back exit--no evidence of it. The front could be exit of a back bullet which fragmented but I do doubt that. Could hte bullet haveX fragmented before hitting the neck so that only a piece went in? As Dick says, the striking velocity has much bearing on whether a bullet will fragment or go to pieces. Yet, a great impact with great breakup of the bullet will sned fragments off for greater distances that a few square mm's. Under my hypothetical situation, the area over which they lie on the X-ray is but a few square mm's. And the fragments themselves are many and miniscule, none over .5mm.

In reference to your working outside, you might like to know that in addition to diet, I am now on an excerise program which has done wonders for me.

Best wishes,

Howard

P.S. Also in reference to the shirt slits, consider my request to Hoover for an examination of them. He won't let the FBI do it, The Archives won't do it nor will they let me (or any researcher.) This certainly adds to the "mystery" over the slits. You have tentative permission to use my efforts here (writing Hoover and the A) in your own writing, if you want to. Check first with me, however.

My last letter from the Archives was signed by Philip R. Ward, Eckhoff's assistant. I don't know if he will continue answering me, but I thought that perhaps through him I could get what the others would not let me (or you) have.

cc. Dick